

**DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY
AND
UNITED STATES STRATEGIC COMMAND CENTER
FOR COMBATING WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION
8725 JOHN J. KINGMAN ROAD, STOP 6201
FORT BELVOIR, VA 22060-6201**

MEMORANDUM FOR INDUSTRY

The Defense Threat Reduction Agency appreciates the feedback received on the J10 Nuclear Enterprise Support Directorate Organizations Request For Proposal. It is in our best interest to ensure there are no inconsistencies or errors in our documents and for industry to provide input on our actions.

In an effort to keep the submissions general in nature, some of the questions/comments have been reworded or consolidated, but the intent of the original submissions were left intact.

Questions and Responses on RFP, PWS, and Sections L & M

| PERFORMANCE WORK SCHEDULE (PWS) | | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| PWS Reference | Question / Comment / Feedback | Government Response |
| PWS 2.0 | The objective of this contract is to provide advisory and assistance services (A&AS) support to [enable] DTRA/SCC-WMD Nuclear Enterprise Support Directorate (J10) to researching, planning, designing, developing, implementing, integrating, testing, applying, and evaluating emerging and mature technologies and developing transitioning capabilities to DTRA customers. Among other things, the reference to research and development seems to apply to other DTRA Directorates, for example, J9. Would the Government please confirm that this is the correct objective statement for this solicitation? If not, would the Government revise the objective statement? | Although the majority of the J10 A&AS requirements are Operating and Maintenance (O&M funded), there are areas as listed in Table 8.0 that are categorized and as Research, Development, Testing and Evaluation (RDT&E funded). The objective statements includes these tasks and is therefore correct as written. |
| M.3.5.1.2 | The PWS provides detailed information on Primary Duties. M.3.5.1.2 requires the Offeror to provide “a comprehensive, detailed narrative that defines, details, and demonstrates the Offeror’s technical understanding of the PWS’s requirements and the Offeror’s corresponding Execution Plan for performing the PWS effort which provides in-depth specificity as to how the Offeror is going to execute the requirements and provide the required deliverables (as applicable).” Would the Government please clarify that they desire an Offeror to write an Execution Plan for how a person does his/her job rather than how an organization like a Department accomplishes its mission? | Paragraph M.3.5.1.2. states “The Offeror provides a comprehensive, detailed narrative that defines, details, and demonstrates the Offeror’s technical understanding of the PWS’s requirements and the Offeror’s corresponding Execution Plan for performing the PWS effort which provides in-depth specificity as to how the Offeror is going to execute the requirements and provide the required deliverables (as applicable).” The intent is and remains, for the Offeror to define, detail, and demonstrate their technical understanding of the PWS’s requirements. |
| PWS 4.0 General | The PWS for some J10 Departments describes functions of the Department that are not covered by the A&AS positions aligned with that Department. For example, J10IE functions include Defense Nuclear Surety Inspection Oversight (DNSIO) which is not supported by any of the aligned A&AS positions. Would the Government please clarify whether DNSIO support is within contractor scope for regular and/or surge support? Another example is J10NS whose functions include support to the Nuclear Weapons Council (NWC) and other senior leader groups which are not supported by any of the aligned A&AS positions. Would the Government please clarify whether NWC and/or other senior leader group support described in PWS 4.6 is within contractor scope for regular and/or surge support? | The PWS for J10 Departments described the functions of that Department/Division, even though there may not be any requirements for that function, the intent was to give Offerors a “big picture” view of J10. However, to ensure there are no misconceptions of what is required, requirements not specifically included in this solicitation were removed from the PWS. |

| | | |
|---------------------|---|--|
| PWS 4.0 General | There are instances in the PWS of inconsistencies between the LCAT, the primary duties, and/or the KSAs. Non-incumbent offerors are at a distinct disadvantage in proposing resumes if the LCAT, duties, and KSAs do not clearly describe the intent of the Government with respect to the seniority of the position and an accurate correlation of the duties and KSAs. Given the discrepancies noted above, would the Government please confirm the correctness of all LCATs and related duties and KSAs in the PWS? | The government has reviewed the PWS and updated where necessary. If there is no reference to Senior, Mid, Junior labor categories, then the Government would expect the Offeror, based on the duties and qualifications to propose individuals that best fit their Technical Approach. |
| PWS 4.0 General | Will the Government provide the minimum education and years of experience for each LCAT in Section 4 of Attachment 1 "PWS?" | The Government has identified positions requiring specific education levels or years of experience in the KSA portions of the PWS. No other discriminators are required if not already stated in revised PWS. |
| PWS 4.3.8.1 | Can serving as network administrator at Cannon AFB from 2014 to the present satisfy the server and work station operating system certificate as that was not required there. Can we secure that certificate post-award? | The government has considered this question and has modified the KSA to read "At a minimum, System Administrators are required to have at least 1 year experience and must have a Security + certification within 60 days of position assignment." |
| PWS 4.4.1.1 | For the Labor Category (LCAT) of Strategic Planner/Analyst, there appears to be some inconsistencies between the LCAT, the primary duties, and the KSAs such that it cannot be determined what level the Government envisions for the position. Would the Government please clarify whether this is a senior, mid, or junior position? In addition, the LCAT title of Strategic Planner does not correlate to the primary duties, which are predominately administrative in nature, or to the KSAs, which do not describe the education or experience reflective of a Strategic Planner. Would the Government please clarify the requirements for this position? | The primary duties, and the KSAs have been updated for the Strategic Planner/Analyst. |
| PWS 4.5.1 and 4.5.2 | Many DoD IV&V specialists and engineers are former or retired uniformed/government personnel who have ample experience, but lack the specific degrees stated in the SOW. Given that the educational requirements of the Computer Systems IV&V Engineer (PWS 4.5.1) and Information Technology IV&V Specialist (PWS 4.5.2) are so much more stringent than a majority of the other labor categories in the SOW, would the Government consider revising the requirements to allow for some amount of relevant experience (e.g., ten years or more of IV&V experience) to substitute for education? This would allow all offerors to propose a broader set of experienced IV&V professionals to meet the requirements. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Government has considered this recommendation and will update the KSAs for paragraph 4.5.1 to read "- M.S. degree required in either Industrial, Software/Systems Engineering or Computer Science from an accredited university -or- a B.S. degree in either Industrial, Software/Systems Engineering or Computer Science from an accredited university and 4 years of experience in industry in a related field is highly desired 2. The KSAs for paragraph of.4.5.2 was changed to read "B.S. degree in either Industrial, Software/Systems Engineering or Computer Science required." |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| PWS 4.5.3 | For the position of Nuclear Weapons SME, the primary duties described do not appear to correlate to the knowledge, skills, and ability (KSA) requirements for that position. For example, the KSA requirements include “nuclear enterprise model development support,” but the primary duties do not include anything resembling model development support. In addition, one of the KSAs for this position includes “nuclear weapons delivery and (C3I) systems design...,” which is identical to the KSA for the position described in 4.6.2.1, which also includes “nuclear enterprise model development and life extension support” as a primary duty. Would the Government please clarify that the KSAs for the position at 4.5.3 are correct? | PWS 4.5.3 has been deleted and is no longer a requirement |
| PWS 4.5.1 & 4.5.2 | Please clarify why Computer Systems IV&V Engineer and the Computer Systems IV&V Specialist are not on-site. | Due to the limited number of seats in DTRA facilities, the requiring office does not have a need for these positions to be on-site. However, the Offeror should carefully consider in their Technical Approach the number of personnel proposed to support the requirements and who will sit where. |
| PWS 4.6.7.2. Requirements and 8.0. Estimated Workload Data | In the table 8.0. Estimated Workload Data, PWS Number 4.6.7.2. is listed as a “Nuclear Security Specialist”. In paragraph 4.6.7.2. of the Requirements, this position is called a “Nuclear Weapons Incident Response Specialist”. Please confirm the correct Position Title/Labor Category? | PWS Table 8.0 has been updated to read “Nuclear Weapons Incident Response Specialist”. |
| PWS 5.1 Period of Performance | Please confirm that the period of performance begins on 6 Feb 2017. Please confirm that the 30-day transition period begins on 6 Feb 2017, as well. | This is correct. The period of performance and the 30-day transition period begin tentatively on 6 Feb 2017. |
| PWS 5.3 Facilities | Please confirm that of three conference rooms, only one is fully restricted to J10 on a noninterference basis. | The requirement is for three meeting spaces with one meeting space given priority (not fully restricted) to J10. In addition, meeting rooms and conference space shall be made available to non-J10 activities on a non-interference, no cost basis. |
| PWS 5.10.1 | Respectfully request the removal of paragraph 5.10.1 so that individual contractors may follow and act in accordance with their own audited and compliant internal policies and procedures regarding overseas travel. If the requirement will not be removed, and since the DTRA requirement is over and above all FAR/DFAR requirements for which Contractors have no historical costs to support pricing of such a requirement, and to provide for a fair competition, request the government provide NTE amounts for Health Consultations which may be required during performance. | DTRA/SCC-WMD Policy 12-01 is mandated and will not be removed. Any costs associated with PWS 5.10.1 should be identified as ODCs. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| PWS Table 6.0 Performance Requirement Summary | Given the US average "time to fill" is currently 43 days, respectfully request the PRS be increased from 14 days to 30 days. | The Government has considered this recommendation and has updated PWS 6.0 to read 30 days. |
| PWS Table 6.0 Performance Requirement Summary | "Contractor shall fill vacant positions...in less than 14 calendar days." This is a questionable requirement, given the standard two-week notice process to current employer for new hires, and will impact the ability to deliver the best talent to DTRA J10. Would the Government consider changing this requirement to 30 calendar days? | The Government has considered this recommendation and has updated PWS 6.0 to read "30 days". |
| PWS 7.0 Travel Request | Please revise Frequency to read, "> 30 days of Travel or in accordance with direction from PM or COR or TM." | PWS 7.0 Travel Request-Frequency has been updated to reflect "> 30 days of Travel or in accordance with direction from PM or COR or TM". |
| PWS 7.0. PWS Presentation Material and Handouts and Conference/Meeting/Training Agenda | To ensure consistency with directions received from the government lead, respectfully request the government revised the frequency to both deliverables to "Draft and final copies as directed by the Government's Technical Lead"? | PWS 7.0. PWS Presentation Material and Handouts and Conference/Meeting/Training Agenda- Frequency has been updated to "Draft and final copies as directed by the Government's Technical Lead" |
| PWS 7.0 Presentation Material and Handouts; specialized reports; conference/meeting training/meeting report and Conference/Meeting/Training Agenda | Please clarify that PM, COR, TM should read PM or COR or TM, in accordance with the original initiator of the request. | PWS Deliver To has been updated in the following areas to read "PM or COR or TM, in accordance with the original initiator of the request": 0 Presentation Material and Handouts; Specialized Reports; Conference/ Meeting Training/Meeting Report; and Conference/ Meeting/Training Agenda. |
| PWS Table 8.0 | The Senior Project Manager duty location is at contractor facilities. Is that location a Government requirement? If a requirement, would the Government consider changing the location to be at DTRA Facilities, or at the discretion of the offeror? | Due to the limited number of seats in DTRA facilities, the Offeror should carefully consider in their Technical Approach the number of personnel proposed to support the requirements and who will sit where. |
| <p align="center">END OF PERFORMANCE WORK SCHEDULE (PWS)</p> | | |

| BASIC RFP | | |
|--|--|---|
| PFP Reference | Question / Comment / Feedback | Government Response |
| General | Does DTRA plan to publish questions that were posed after its release of the Draft RFP? | To the best of our knowledge, the Government has responded to all questions asked. If there has been an oversight, please identify the specific questions the Government has not responded to. |
| General | To allow all offerors the opportunity to accommodate any possible changes to solicitation requirements, would the Government consider granting a two-week due date extension? | The Government has extended the due date for the J10 A&AS RFP to 3 August 2016 |
| Section H, Section I | <p>The Section H clause 252.215-9004 Key Personnel requires CO approval to replace any contractor key personnel to ensure continuity of management and performance, which is necessary and appropriate for the effort. Clause 252.215-9007 Substitution of Personnel requires a similar level of approval for other than key personnel under the contract, "to ensure continuous performance of work." Requiring CO notification and justification/approval for additional Contractor employees (other than Key) will likely result in the unintended consequences of delaying the process to fill open positions and would impact the flexibility of the Contractor to operate within internal HR parameters to manage its employees and to minimize gaps in support to the government.</p> <p>To ensure Contractor has adequate control over the staffing of the program, and timely capture/hire of replacement candidates, request the clause 252.215-9007 be deleted.</p> | Clause 252.215-9007 Substitution of Personnel details the mechanism the Contractor shall use to implement Clause 252.215-9004 Key Personnel. This clause will not be deleted and only applies to Key Personnel. |
| Attachment L-2, Present and Past Performance Questionnaire | Attachment L-2, page 2, states, "If the response in Question 3B is Prime, proceed to Question 4." The correct wording should be "Question 3C", not "3B." The same applies to Subcontractor statement. | Attachment L-2 will be updated and reposted. |
| DD Form 254 Block 10 | Would the government modify the DD Form 254, in accordance with the levels of material required, to allow access to COMSEC, CNWDI, SCI, Non-SCI, special access information, Other - SIPRNet, STE, ACCM, receive and generate classified data, store classified hardware, require COMSEC account, defense courier service, to reflect requirements of the Solicitation? | The Government will modify Block 10 on the DD Form 254 upon contract award to reflect requirements of the Solicitation. |

**END OF
BASIC RFP QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES**

| SECTIONS L & M | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| Sections L & M Reference | Question / Comment / Feedback | Government Response |
| Table L.1.2 | Proposal Organization states, "The page limit for the Execution Plans for Subfactors B and C combined shall not exceed 75 pages." Would the Government please clarify whether the 75 pages are inclusive of the Staffing Matrix and Resumes? | IAW L.1.3.5.3. The Staffing Matrix is not part of the page count. Resumes will be added to paragraph L1.3.5.3, however, there is a two page limit per resume IAW Table L.1.2. Proposal Organization. |
| Table L.1.2 and L.3.3.2 | Given the way the Management subfactor is requested, non-incumbent teams are at a disadvantage regarding their explanation of the transition between a new contractor and the current incumbent. Would the Government consider allowing 10 additional pages for the Management subfactor, uniquely entitled Transition Plan, and factoring the Transition Plan into the weighted criteria in Section M? | The sections under Subfactor A: Management Approach have been rearranged in paragraphs L3.3.2 and M.3.5.1.1. The incoming Transition Plan is now Section 5. Sections 1-4 are now limited to total page count of 15 pages collectively and Section 5 will be limited to 10 pages. Any excess pages from Section 1-4 or Section 5 can not be used to offset the page count in another section. Section 5 will solely be evaluated for Transition. |
| L.1.2 | Please confirm if Subcontractors are required to submit only Volume IV-Cost. | Yes that is correct. The Subcontractors are required to submit only Volume IV-Cost. Management and technical areas should be included in the Primes proposal. |
| L1.2.13b | To ensure clarity on the OCI restrictions will the awardee be permitted to bid on the Defense Stockpile Management Systems (DSMS) performer contract? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Incumbent A&AS contractor or any sub directly supporting the J10NL office will not authorized to compete for the DSMS contract due to OCI restrictions. 2. Since both the J10 A&AS RFP and the DSMS RFP are running concurrently, for the procurement cycle only, there is no competitive edge to be gained by any Offeror other than those identified in #1 above, therefore, Offerors not currently supporting J10NL are permitted to propose on both contracts. However, since the A&AS contract J10NL support includes 3rd party Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) of the work on the DSMS contract, a single contractor will not be awarded both contracts. Dependent upon which contract is awarded first, if the Offeror submitting the awarded proposal for the first award submitted a proposal for both efforts, their proposal for the second awarded will be removed from consideration. |
| L.2.12 | Would the Government please clarify that the small business subcontracting goal is 25% total, inclusive of the 10% requirement for SDVOSBs (not 25% plus 10% SDVOSB as seemingly implied by language in the section's second paragraph)? | The small business subcontracting goal is 25% total, inclusive of the 10% requirement |
| L.1.3.8 | Please identify the number of electronic copies are required for each volume. | L1.2.(a) was updated to read "Offerors shall provide two electronic copies of the "ORIGINAL" Volumes I, II, III, and IV of the proposal L.1.3.8" |

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| L.2.12 | Will the Government please clarify if the Small Business requirements are calculated as a percentage of the total proposed contract value including Other Direct Costs (ODCs), or if the Small Business requirement will be calculated as a percentage of only the total proposed labor value? This question is submitted because of the significant ODC value provided in the Solicitation. | L.2.12 is clear. The subcontracting goal of at least 25% is of the total contract value proposed |
| L.2.13 | The PWS for this solicitation is broken down into “primary duties” for 29 separate contractor positions. Section L.3.3.3, Tab 1, Execution Plan requires a detailed narrative and “in depth specificity as to how the Offeror is going to execute the requirements and provide the required deliverables.” As a trusted agent, the incumbent personnel in each position have access to “plans, policies, reports, studies, financial plans or data which has not been released or otherwise made available to the public” (OCI b (2), page 25 of the final RFP). Per the OCI clause, would the Government please clarify how they will ensure that the incumbent will not “compete for work based on such information?” | The Government has processes in place to ensure an incumbents’ eligibility (and their Subs) to compete for any work within a specific area regardless of the type of contract the incumbent was initially awarded or the area the Sub is currently supporting. |
| L.3.3.2 | Second paragraph states (Subfactor A for Contingency and ...; and Subfactor B for Nuclear Enterprise....) M.3.2 Evaluation Factors states subfactor Subfactor B consists of Contingency and Exercise,...and Subfactor C consists of Nuclear Enterprise Support Directorate,... Request the government adjust Section L to match section M to ensure consistency in submittal. | L3.3.3 has been updated to read “Subfactor B for Contingency and Exercise Department, Nuclear Inspections and Education Department and Nuclear Surety Division Technical Approaches; and Subfactor C for Nuclear Enterprise Support Directorate, Mission Assurance Department and Nuclear Logistics Operations Department” |
| L.3.3.2 and M 3.5.1.1 | There appear to be some inconsistencies between paragraphs L.3.3.2 and M 3.5.1.1 in terms of instructions and evaluation criteria. For example, L3.3.2, Section 1(e) requires the offeror to address “Rapid Response” which is not included in M.3.5.1.1. Similarly, L.3.3.2 does not require the offeror to address quality assurance, which is an evaluated factor in M.3.5.1.1. Would the Government please clarify? | Paragraphs L.3.3.2 and M.3.5.1.1 have been updated. |
| L.3.3.3 and M.3.5.1.2, Tab 2 | Would the Government please clarify whether names are required for all non-Key positions? How will the Staffing Matrix be evaluated/scored if positions in the Staffing Matrix are listed as “TBD” or “Incumbent Capture?” | Names are only required for Key Personnel. In addition, a new column was included titled “Description of Labor Category” for Offerors to describe the duties of the approved Labor Category being proposed. An example of this will be updated in Table L3.3.3 and M.5.7. The Government will evaluate the Offerors understanding of the position requirements by evaluating the Description of Labor Category for each position (regardless if named or not). |

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| L.3.3.3 and M.3.5.1.2, Tab 2 | For non-Key positions not accompanied by a resume, the Staffing Matrix doesn't include any information on the named individual for the Government to assess whether the individual is qualified to perform the function. How will the Government evaluate non-Key positions that have a name in the Staffing Matrix with no accompanying resume? | The Staffing Matrix is evaluated to ensure the individuals or Labor Categories proposed in the Technical Approach are the same in the Staffing Matrix, and are the same as in the Cost Proposal. If an Offeror does not name non-key personnel they have met the requirement. Offerors who name non-key personnel and provide resumes will be evaluated as such. |
| L.3.3.3 | As a Technical Approach (rather than Management) factor. Would the Government please clarify that Subfactor B includes Contingency and Exercise Department, Nuclear Inspections and Education Department and Nuclear Surety Division Technical Approaches; and Subfactor C includes Nuclear Enterprise Support Directorate, Mission Assurance Department and Nuclear Logistics Operations Department? | L3.3.3 has been updated to read "Subfactor B for Contingency and Exercise Department, Nuclear Inspections and Education Department and Nuclear Surety Division Technical Approaches; and Subfactor C for Nuclear Enterprise Support Directorate, Mission Assurance Department and Nuclear Logistics Operations Department" |
| L.3.3.3 | "The Offeror shall submit a comprehensive Technical Approach broke out into 3 sections for each subfactor...Each Technical Approach submittal shall include three tabs, one for each of the following..." M.3.5.1.2 states that the Technical Approach subfactor is met when each of the six Technical Approaches meet the following criteria: Execution Plan, Staffing Plan, and Resumes. Would the Government please clarify whether the Offeror should provide Execution Plans, Staffing Plans, and Resumes broken out by the two Subfactors (B and C) or broken out by each Technical Approach (Contingency and Exercise; Nuclear Inspections and Education; Nuclear Surety; Nuclear Enterprise Support Directorate, Mission Assurance; and Nuclear Logistics Operations)? | L3.3.3 is correct as written. "Each <u>Technical Approach (not Subfactor)</u> submittal shall include three tabs, one for each of the following: " |
| L.3.3.3 | Would the Government please clarify whether the Staffing Plan Matrix should only include Key Personnel as described in the L.3.3.3, Tab 2 paragraph, or whether the Offeror must show Key and non-Key personnel as shown in the Example Staffing Plan Matrix? | The requirement is for Key Personnel to be listed by name in the Matrix. It was the intent to provide flexibility to Offerors for non-Key Personnel to provide names or TBD (or something similar) if they choose not to provide specific individuals. An example of this will be updated in Table L3.3.3 and M.5.7. |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| L.3.3.3 and M.3.5.1.2 | The description of Tab 2 is very clear and consistent in describing a Staffing Plan Matrix. The evaluation criteria describing Tab 2 in M.3.5.1.2 uses the terms Staffing Plan and Staffing Plan Matrix; these two terms appear synonymous in M.3.5.1.2. Is it the Government's intent to avoid redundancy elsewhere in the proposal such that Tab 2 consists solely or predominantly of a Staffing Plan Matrix like the example table shown in Section L.3.3.3, or does the Government expect or desire other staffing items to be addressed and evaluated in Tab 2? | M.3.5.1.2. Tab 2 will be retitled to Staffing Plan Matrix. Tab 2 consists solely or predominantly of a Staffing Plan Matrix like the example table shown in Section L.3.3.3 |
| L.4.3 | Will the government consider requiring past performance to be completed within the last 3 years to ensure relevancy? | I AW L.4.3. The Government's requirement for references representing recent contracts (within the past five years) has been reviewed and will remain unchanged. <u>Narrowing the time period could inadvertently exclude experienced performers and limiting competition</u> |
| L.5.3.3 Government Furnished Property (GFP)/Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) and PWS 5.4. Government Furnished Equipment (GFE)/Government Furnished Information (GFI) | Will the government provide laptops with DTRANet-U for contractors outside the DTRC? | The Government will provide the necessary IT equipment or access to IT equipment for all contractors to perform their required tasks. PWS 5.4 has been updated. |
| L.5.3.4.4 | Please clarify the intent of "Compensation System Approval" noted in Section L.5.3.4.4, and confirm that an Offerors DCMA designation of adequate/approved Accounting System (which includes the subsystem of compensation), would meet the "Compensation System Approval" solicitation requirement. | Yes that is correct. Offerors DCMA designation of adequate/approved Accounting System (which includes the subsystem of compensation), will meet the "Compensation System Approval" solicitation requirement |
| L.5.6.6 | To ensure a fair competition, and in accordance with the NTE provided for Travel (which is an ODC), will the government provide a NTE amount for other ODC's (in addition to the Travel ODC NTE)? | The Government believes it is in its best interest to have Offerors propose ODC's since they are generally a known entity to the Offeror and not the Government. A Travel plug was provided since only the Government knows its travel requirements. |
| L.5.6.7 and PWS 5.3 | Would the government consider either providing a "plug number" that would represent the full cost of installation and maintenance of the connection to the DTRA Classified Network or clarify that the costs to be included in the proposal are limited to the lease cost of the separate line? | The Governments intent was for SIPRNet Access vice SNET. Any costs for SIPRNet installation should be submitted as an ODC. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| M.3.2 and M.3.3 | The RFP states that Subfactor A (Management Approach) and Subfactor B (Technical Approach – Contingency and Exercise Department, Nuclear Inspections and Education Department and Nuclear Surety Division) are of equal importance and are significantly more important than Subfactor C (Technical Approach – Nuclear Enterprise Support Directorate, Mission Assurance Department, and Nuclear Logistics Operations Department). Would the Government please clarify that Subfactor C is of equal importance to Subfactors A and B? | M.3.2 and M3.3 are correct as written. Subfactor C is of lesser importance than Subfactor A and B. |
| M.3.5.1.1 Section 4 | Did the government intend for SIPRNet access in contractor facilities? If so, will DTRA allowing SNET access from contractor facilities? | The Governments intent was for SIPRNet Access vice SNET. M.3.5.1.1 Section 4 will be updated to reflect change. |
| <p style="text-align: center;">END OF SECTIONS L & M QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES</p> | | |